



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 15/719,229	FILING DATE 04/10/95	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR THRIFT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 11-20205
-------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

RUBEN C DELEON
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474 MS 219
DALLAS TX 75265

26M1/0327

EXAMINER CHAWAN, V

ART UNIT 2308	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

03/27/97

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

VRE

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/419,229

Applicant(s)

Thrift et al.

Examiner

Vijay Chawan

Group Art Unit

2308

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 17, 1997

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Cross reference to related applications does not contain the serial number, or title, or the filing date of the related application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Stefanopoulos et al., [5,333,237] and in view of Schmandt et al., ["Augmenting a Window System with Speech Input", Computer Magazine, 8/90, Vol.23, Issue 8, pages 50-56].

As per claims 1-19, Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., teach the limitations as described in paper #4, paragraph # 3, except for the newly added limitation of "... an information resource located on a computer network...".

Schmandt et al., a teach a window system that links together workstations. (Page 51, Col.2, paragraph 3, "Windows systems..."). It would have been obvious to one

with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that workstations linked together form a network and are served by a server which acts as an information resource, because an artisan would recognize that this is an efficient usage of space available.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/17/97 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicants' argument that " The cited art does not even mention accessing a data base over the Internet or any other network.", and, "The combination of the references would not teach or suggest Applicants' invention to one with ordinary skill in the art.", examiner disagrees. Schmandt et al., teach a windows based system that is navigable by speech connect together, "... Window system because it is a defacto standard across workstations." [(Page 51, Col.2, paragraphs 3 & 4, "Windows systems..."). The definition of a server is a main computer acting as a server makes resources available to computers acting as workstations on a network, thereby giving those workstations access to all the resources available on that server including all it's databases.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Computer Dictionary (Microsoft Press, 1993, second edition, page 355).

Cummings Jr., [5,301,105] teaches a fully integrated and comprehensive health care system that includes the integrated interconnection and interaction of the patient , health care provider, bank or other financial institution, insurance company, utilization reviewer and employer so as to include within a single system each of the essential participants to provide patients with complete and comprehensive pre- , post- treatment health care and financial support and which is accessible via Internet.

Raman et al., [5,572,625] teach a method for generating audio renderings of digitized works having highly technical content having a browsing capability.


5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay Chawan whose telephone number is [703]305-3836.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allen R. MacDonald, can be reached at [703]305-9708. The facsimile phone number for this group is [703]308-5399.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is [703]305-3900.



ALLEN R. MACDONALD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2308

Vijay Chawan
March 21, 1997